REMARKS

Claims 1-4,6, 15, 17, 20, 21, 25, 27 and 29 remain in this application. Applicant respectfully requests re-examination.

Applicant submits herewith a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21 and 25-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *K. Cech* (US 3,346,222) in view of *Wolf et al.* (US 5,110,660). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Wolf et al. is concerned with a rubber spring element for automobiles which consists of a rubber block that is traversed by hollow channels and cavities. The cavities formed in the rubber block are spherical and uniformly distributed throughout the block. Only one hollow channel traverses each cavity.

As can be seen in *Wolf et al.'s* figures, his rubber block has a matrix of hollow channels, group 2 channels are parallel to each other, and group 4 channels are parallel to each other, and perpendicular to the group 2 channels. The spherical cavities 3 and 5 disposed within the rubber block are intersected by these channels (column 3, lines 59-68).

This rubber block is designed for use in soft springing of relatively great masses such as in automobiles (column 1, lines 46-54). The *Wolf et al.* rubber block is directed to receiving loads from one direction, as illustrated by load vector F1 in Figure 2, at right angles to the stratified channel group planes (column 4, lines 8-13).

Wolf et al. illustrates a second embodiment for his spring rubber block in Figure 3 wherein radial hollow channels 6 extend from the periphery of the rubber block into a central bore 7 that is along the vertical axis of the rubber block extending from one end face to the other end face and open at both ends (column 4, lines 16-20). The central bore 7 lies along the central axis.

The rubber spring of Figure 3, in *Wolf et al.,* is designed to accept a load from one direction, a load vector that is parallel to the central axis of central bore 7 (column 4, lines 20-25).

K. Cech is directed to providing a resilient support on foot 3 for the rod-like leg of a microphone stand. *Cech's* resilient foot 3 is designed for damping impact shock to the microphone stand. The resilient foot 3 which is put onto each leg of a microphone stand is a solid of revolution in the form of two slender conical frustums 3a and 3b. A cylindrical bore 4 extends inwardly from one end. A leg 1 of a stand is inserted in a second cylindrical bore 2 that extends inwardly from the other end of the foot 3. The end with cylindrical bore 4 rests on the ground. The cylindrical bore in foot 3 that does not hold the leg provides a cushioning effect (column 4, lines 20-28).

The present invention is directed to a multiple axis vibration isolator which dampens vibrations resulting from high acceleration and deceleration levels on electronic components that are located in a spacecraft, for example.

The present invention accomplishes this by "a body having a main axis of symmetry, a top end, a bottom end, and a perimeter, the body made of an elastomeric material having a stable modulus of elasticity, with a plurality of passageways equidistantly spaced around the perimeter of the body extending from the perimeter through the body between the top and bottom ends and intersecting at the main axis of the body, the passageways establishing a resonant frequency of vibration for the isolator body; and the cavity in the top end of the body having a perimeter and a bottom surface extending diametrically within the perimeter for receiving the electronic component to be isolated from the lateral and vertical shock, the electronic component bonded to the bottom surface of the cavity; whereby the vibration isolator attenuates all vibration above about 1.4 times the resonant frequency of the isolator body."

This specific function of the claimed invention is discussed in the specification and shown in Figure 10 of the drawings.

None of the art of record shows, teaches or implies the structure of a vibration isolator which has "a plurality of passageways equidistantly spaced around the perimeter of the body extending from the perimeter through the body and intersecting at the main axis of the body, the passageways establishing a resonant frequency of vibration for the isolator body." Nor does the prior art of record show, teach or imply an isolator that "attenuates all vibration above about 1.4 times the resonant frequency of the isolator body."

Claims 15 and 21 are also directed to an isolator of this type.

In light of the above arguments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the claims remaining in this application are allowable and requests that they be allowed and this application passed to issue.

Sincerely,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Albin H. Gess
Registration No. 25,726
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, California 92626
Telephone: (714) 427-7020
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799